



TTAB

IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE
BEFORE THE TRADEMARK TRIAL AND APPEAL BOARD

LA SENZA CORP.,

Opposer,

VS.

OLYMPIC MOUNTAIN AND MARINE
PRODUCTS, INC.,

Applicant.

Opposition No. 91185325

77/071,961

**MOTION TO EXTEND OPPOSER'S DEADLINE TO
RESPOND TO APPLICANT'S MOTION FOR LEAVE TO AMEND**

COME NOW the Opposer, by and through counsel, and respectfully moves the Trademark Trial and Appeal Board ("Board") for an Order extending the current deadline for Opposer to respond to Applicant's Motion for Leave to Amend ("Applicant's Motion") by one week, namely until **March 22, 2010**.

The parties had been discussing possible resolution of Applicant's Motion, and, later, this proceeding generally. During this time, Opposer had deferred its response to Applicant's Motion, and Applicant had consented to the extensions.

As indicated in Opposer's last extension request, Applicant conveyed to Opposer a generalized settlement proposal. Subsequently, Opposer tendered a counter-proposal, and also requested Applicant's further consent to another extension of time to respond to Applicant's Motion while the parties negotiated for a possible settlement.

On March 12, 2010 -- the last business day prior to Opposer's filing deadline -- Applicant's counsel sent an email rejecting Opposer's settlement counter-proposal. However, the email was silent on Opposer's earlier request for an extension of time. Opposer's counsel noted (with surprise) Applicant's response to Opposer's counter-proposal and suggested a telephone conference early the



03-15-2010

following week (Opposer's counsel was not in the office on March 12, 2010). Also, Opposer again sought Applicant's position on the earlier requested consent for an extension.

Applicant's counsel refused his consent.


As noted above, Opposer deferred finalizing and filing a response to Applicant's Motion while the parties had been engaged in discussions – the result of which may have been to obviate the need for its filing. Now that such discussions appear to be concluded, Opposer will submit its response to Applicant's Motion. However, Opposer requires more time than a single business day to finalize and file its response to Applicant's Motion.

In view of the circumstances and the modest length of the extension request, Opposer respectfully requests the Board to grant the present request.

Respectfully submitted,

LA SENZA CORP.

By:


George W. Lewis
Matthew J. Cuccias
JACOBSON HOLMAN, PLLC
400 Seventh Street, N.W.
Washington, D.C. 20004
(202) 638-6666
Attorneys for Opposer

March 15, 2010

CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE

I hereby certify that on this 15th day of March, 2010, a true copy of the foregoing Motion to Extend Opposer's Deadline to Respond to Motion for Leave to Amend was served by first-class mail, postage prepaid, upon counsel for Applicant:

Philip A. Kantor, Esq.
Law Offices of Philip A. Kantor, P.C.
1781 Village Center Circle, Suite 120
Las Vegas, Nevada 89134

